arXiv:1605.08711v2 [math.QA] 2 Dec 2016

THE ISOMORPHISM PROBLEM FOR QUANTUM AFFINE SPACES, HOMOGENIZED QUANTIZED WEYL ALGEBRAS, AND QUANTUM MATRIX ALGEBRAS

JASON GADDIS

ABSTRACT. Bell and Zhang have shown that if A and B are two connected graded algebras finitely generated in degree one that are isomorphic as ungraded algebras, then they are isomorphic as graded algebras. We exploit this result to solve the isomorphism problem in the cases of quantum affine spaces, quantum matrix algebras, and homogenized multiparameter quantized Weyl algebras. Our result involves determining the degree one normal elements, factoring out, and then repeating. This creates an iterative process that allows one to determine relationships between relative parameters.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout, $\Bbbk$ is a field and all algebras are $\Bbbk$-algebras. All isomorphisms should be read as 'isomorphisms as $\Bbbk$-algebras'. Our primary source for all definitions is [4].

Hypothesis 1. A is a connected graded algebra finitely generated over $\Bbbk$ in degree 1.

Let R and S be algebras satisfying Hypothesis 1 with bases $\{x_i\}$ and $\{y_i\}$, respectively. Then R and S are isomorphic as graded algebras if there exists an algebra isomorphism $\Phi : R \to S$ such that $\Phi(x_i) = \sum \alpha_{ij} y_j$, $\alpha_{ij} \in \Bbbk$, for each x_i. If $a_{ij} \neq 0$, then we say y_j is a summand of $\Phi(x_i)$. Because of the following result, we will often assume without comment that isomorphisms between graded algebras are graded isomorphisms.

Theorem 1 (Bell, Zhang [3, Theorem 0.1])**.** Let A and B be two algebras satisfying Hypothesis 1. If $A \cong B$ as ungraded algebras, then $A \cong B$ as graded algebras.

A square matrix $\mathbf{p} = (p_{ij}) \in \mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk^\times)$ is multiplicatively antisymmetric if $p_{ii} = 1$ and $p_{ij} = p_{ji}^{-1}$ for all $i \neq j$. Let $\mathcal{A}_n \subset \mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk^\times)$ be the subset of multiplicatively antisymmetric matrices. A matrix $\mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{A}_n$ is a permutation of $\mathbf{p}$ if there exists a permutation $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n$ such that $q_{ij} = p_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)}$ for all i, j.

For $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}_n$, the (multiparameter) quantum affine n-space $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{p}}(\Bbbk^n)$ is defined as the algebra with basis $\{x_i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, subject to the relations $x_i x_j = p_{ij} x_j x_i$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

Theorem 2 (Theorem 2.4)**.** $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{p}}(\Bbbk^n) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{q}}(\Bbbk^m)$ if and only if $m = n$ and $\mathbf{p}$ is a permutation of $\mathbf{q}$.

Mori proved Theorem 2.4 when $n = 3$ [10, Example 4.10] and this was extended to all n by Vitoria [11, Lemma 2.3]. We present a simple, self-contained proof that does not rely on the noncommutative projective algebraic geometry associated to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{p}}(\Bbbk^n)$.

(Multiparameter) quantized Weyl algebras may be regarded as γ-difference operators on $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{p}}(\Bbbk^n)$. Let $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}_n$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n) \in (\Bbbk^\times)^n$. Then $A_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma}(\Bbbk)$ is the algebra with basis $\{x_i, y_i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, subject to the relations

$$\begin{aligned}
y_i y_j &= p_{ij} y_j y_i && (\text{all } i, j)\\
x_i x_j &= \gamma_i p_{ij} x_j x_i && (i < j)\\
x_i y_j &= p_{ji} y_j x_i && (i < j)\\
x_i y_j &= \gamma_j p_{ji} y_j x_i && (i > j)\\
x_j y_j &= 1 + \gamma_j y_j x_j + \sum_{l<j} (\gamma_l - 1) y_l x_l && (\text{all } j).
\end{aligned}$$

In the case of $n = 1$, the parameter $\mathbf{p}$ plays no role and so we refer to the single parameter simply as p and write $A_1^p(\Bbbk)$. By [5, Section 6], $A_1^p(\Bbbk) \cong A_1^q(\Bbbk)$ if and only if $p = q^{\pm 1}$. Goodearl and Hartwig solved the isomorphism problem for quantized Weyl algebras when no γ_i is a root of unity [7, Theorem 5.1]. They proved that if $A_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma}(\Bbbk) \cong A_m^{\mathbf{q},\mu}(\Bbbk)$, then $n = m$ and there exists a sign vector $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ such that

$$\mu_i = \gamma_i^{\varepsilon_i} \tag{1-1}$$

and $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}$ satisfy

$$q_{ij} = \begin{cases} p_{ij} & \text{if } (\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_j) = (1, 1),\\ p_{ji} & \text{if } (\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_j) = (-1, 1),\\ \gamma_i^{-1} p_{ji} & \text{if } (\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_j) = (1, -1),\\ \gamma_i p_{ij} & \text{if } (\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_j) = (-1, -1). \end{cases} \tag{1-2}$$

The isomorphisms they give hold regardless of the root-of-unity condition. Levitt and Yakimov have extended this result to the case where all parameters are roots of unity and $A_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma}(\Bbbk), A_m^{\mathbf{q},\mu}(\Bbbk)$ are free over their centers by utilizing noncommutative discriminants [9, Corollary 6.4]. Several intermediate cases are still open.

The quantized Weyl algebras are not graded and so we consider their homogenizations. The homogenized (multiparamenter) quantized Weyl algebra $H_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma}$ has algebra basis $\{z, x_i, y_i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, where z commutes with the x_i and y_i. The relations in $H_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma}$ are the same as those for $A_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma}(\Bbbk)$ except the final relation type is replaced by its homogenization,

$$x_j y_j = z^2 + \gamma_j y_j x_j + \sum_{l<j} (\gamma_l - 1) y_l x_l.$$

The isomorphisms defined by Goodearl and Hartwig extend to isomorphisms in the homogenized case by fixing the homogenizing variable. The next theorem suggests that the Goodearl-Hartwig result should hold in general.

Theorem 3 (Theorem 4.4)**.** Let $\gamma, \mu \in (\Bbbk^\times)^n$ and $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{A}_n$ Then $\Phi : H_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma} \to H_m^{\mathbf{q},\mu}$ is an isomorphism if and only if $n = m$ and there exists $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ such that γ and μ satisfy (1-1) while $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{q}$ satisfy (1-2).

Fix parameters $\lambda \in \Bbbk^\times$ and $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}_n$. The (multiparameter) quantum $(n \times n)$ matrix algebra, $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$, is the algebra with basis $\{X_{ij}\}$, $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, subject to the relations

$$X_{lm}X_{ij} = \begin{cases} p_{li}p_{jm}X_{ij}X_{lm} + (\lambda - 1)p_{li}X_{im}X_{lj} & l > i, m > j \\ \lambda p_{li}p_{jm}X_{ij}X_{lm} & l > i, m \leq j \\ p_{jm}X_{ij}X_{lm} & l = i, m > j. \end{cases}$$

By [1, Theorem 2], $\operatorname{GK.dim}(\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))) = n^2$ if and only if $\lambda \neq -1$. We show in Theorem 3.4 that the ideal of $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$ generated by degree one normal elements is $\langle X_{1n}, X_{n1}\rangle$ when $\lambda \neq 1$. On the other hand, every degree one generator of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{q}}(\Bbbk^m)$ is normal. This, combined with the fact that $\operatorname{GK.dim}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{q}}(\Bbbk^m)) = m$ ([4, Lemma II.9.7]) proves that $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk)) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{q}}(\Bbbk^m)$ if and only if $m = n^2$ and $\lambda = 1$. Hence, we ignore the cases $\lambda = \pm 1$ henceforth.

The isomorphism problem in the single parameter case of $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$ for all n was solved in [5, Proposition 3.1], as was the multiparameter case for $n = 2$ [5, Proposition 4.2]. We extend these results in the following theorem.

Theorem 4 (Theorem 5.8)**.** $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk)) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_m(\Bbbk))$ if and only if $n = m$ and one of the following cases holds:

(1) $\lambda = \mu$ and $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}$;
(2) $\lambda = \mu$ and $p_{ij} = \lambda^{-1}q_{ji}$ for all i, j;
(3) $\lambda = \mu^{-1}$ and $p_{ij} = q_{n+1-i,n+1-j}$ for all i, j;
(4) $\lambda = \mu^{-1}$ and $p_{ij} = \lambda^{-1}q_{n+1-j,n+1-i}$ for all i, j.

2. Quantum affine spaces

Lemma 2.1. Let $\Phi : R \to S$ be a graded isomorphism between algebras satisfying Hypothesis 1 with homogeneous generators $\{x_i\}$ and $\{y_i\}$, respectively, $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then there exists a permutation $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_n$ such that $y_{\tau(i)}$ is a summand of $\Psi(x_i)$ for each i.

Proof. Write $\Phi(x_i) = \sum \gamma_{ij}y_j$ and let $M = (\gamma_{ij})_{ij}$. Because Φ is an isomorphism, $\det(M) \neq 0$. For k, $1 \leq k \leq n$, let $I = \{1, \ldots, k\}$. Choose $J \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $|J| = k$ and such that the minor $M_{IJ} \neq 0$. We claim there exists an injective map of sets $\tau : I \to J$.

If $k = 1$ and M_{1j} denotes the $(1, j)$-minor of M, then we have

$$0 \neq \det(M) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^{j+1}\gamma_{1j}M_{1j}.$$

Hence, there exists j such that $\gamma_{1j}M_{1j} \neq 0$. Set $\tau(1) = j$.

Suppose inductively that the claim holds for some $k < n$. Since $\det(M) \neq 0$, there exists a nonzero minor N of size $(k+1) \times (k+1)$. Let $I', J' \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $M_{I'J'} = N$, so $|I'| = |J'| = k+1$. As above, we can choose ℓ such that $\gamma_{i_1 j_\ell} N_{1j_\ell} \neq 0$ and set $\tau(i_1) = j_\ell$. Now apply the inductive hypothesis to $I = \{i_2, \ldots, i_{k+1}\}$ and $J = \{j_1, \ldots, \widehat{j_\ell}, \ldots, j_{k+1}\}$. The result follows by setting $N = M$. □

For the remainder of this section, let $\{x_i\}$, $\{y_i\}$ be bases for $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{p}}(\Bbbk^n)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{q}}(\Bbbk^n)$, respectively. and suppose $\Phi : \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{p}}(\Bbbk^n) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{q}}(\Bbbk^n)$ is a isomorphism. We claim $\mathbf{p} = \tau.\mathbf{q}$ where $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_n$ is determined by Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 2.2. If $r, s \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $p_{rs} \neq 1$, then $p_{rs} = q_{\tau(r)\tau(s)}$.

Proof. Write $\Phi(x_r) = \sum \alpha_i y_i$ and $\Phi(x_s) = \sum \beta_i y_i$. Then,

$$0 = \Phi(x_r x_s - p_{rs} x_s x_r) = (1 - p_{rs}) \left(\sum_{d=1}^{n} \alpha_d \beta_d y_d^2 \right) + \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} (\alpha_i \beta_j - p_{rs} \alpha_j \beta_i)\, y_i y_j.$$

Since $p_{rs} \neq 1$, then $\alpha_d = 0$ or $\beta_d = 0$ for each d. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Phi(x_r x_s - p_{rs} x_s x_r) && (2\text{-}1) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} [(\alpha_i \beta_j - p_{rs} \alpha_j \beta_i) + q_{ji}(\alpha_j \beta_i - p_{rs} \alpha_i \beta_j)]\, y_i y_j \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} [(\alpha_j \beta_i (q_{ji} - p_{rs}) + \alpha_i \beta_j (1 - q_{ji} p_{rs})]\, y_i y_j. && (2\text{-}2) \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.1, $\alpha_{\tau(r)}$, $\beta_{\tau(s)} \neq 0$. Thus, $\alpha_{\tau(s)} = 0$ and $\beta_{\tau(r)} = 0$. If $\tau(r) > \tau(s)$, then by (2-2) the coefficient of $y_{\tau(s)} y_{\tau(r)}$ is $\alpha_{\tau(r)} \beta_{\tau(s)} (q_{\tau(r)\tau(s)} - p_{rs})$. Therefore, $p_{rs} = q_{\tau(r)\tau(s)}$. One the other hand, if $\tau(r) < \tau(s)$, then the coefficient of $y_{\tau(r)} y_{\tau(s)}$ is $\alpha_{\tau(r)} \beta_{\tau(s)} (1 - q_{\tau(s)\tau(r)} p_{rs})$. Therefore, $p_{rs} = q_{\tau(s)\tau(r)}^{-1} = q_{\tau(r)\tau(s)}$. Because $p_{rs} \neq 1$, then $r \neq s$ and so, because τ is a permutation, $\tau(r) \neq \tau(s)$. □

Lemma 2.3. If $r, s \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $p_{rs} = 1$, then $p_{rs} = q_{\tau(r)\tau(s)}$.

Proof. Define $\mathbf{p}^{\#} = \{p_{ij} \in \mathbf{p} \mid p_{ij} \neq 1\}$ and $\mathbf{q}^{\#}$ similarly. By Lemma 2.2, $\mathbf{p}^{\#} \leq \mathbf{q}^{\#}$. Because Φ is an isomorphism, then we can apply Lemma 2.2 to Φ^{-1} to get that $\mathbf{q}^{\#} \leq \mathbf{p}^{\#}$. Thus, $\mathbf{p}^{\#} = \mathbf{q}^{\#}$. It follows that $p_{rs} = 1$ implies $q_{\tau(r)\tau(s)} = 1$ so $p_{rs} = q_{\tau(r)\tau(s)}$ for all $r, s \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. □

Theorem 2.4. $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{p}}(\Bbbk^n) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{q}}(\Bbbk^m)$ if and only if $m = n$ and $\mathbf{p}$ is a permutation of $\mathbf{q}$.

Proof. Suppose $n = m$ and there exists $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n$ such that $\mathbf{p} = \sigma.\mathbf{q}$. Define a map $\Psi : \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{p}}(\Bbbk^n) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{q}}(\Bbbk^n)$ by $x_i \mapsto y_{\sigma(i)}$. For all i, j, $1 \leq i, j \leq n$,

$$\Psi(x_i)\Psi(x_j) - p_{ij}\Psi(x_j)\Psi(x_i) = y_{\sigma(i)} y_{\sigma(j)} - q_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)} y_{\sigma(j)} y_{\sigma(i)} = 0.$$

Hence, Ψ extends to a bijective homomorphism. Thus, $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{p}}(\Bbbk^n) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{q}}(\Bbbk^n)$.

If $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{p}}(\Bbbk^n) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{q}}(\Bbbk^m)$, then $n = \operatorname{GK.dim}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{p}}(\Bbbk^n)) = \operatorname{GK.dim}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{q}}(\Bbbk^m)) = m$, so $n = m$. By Lemmas 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 there exists a permutation $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_n$ such that $\mathbf{p} = \tau.\mathbf{q}$. □

3. Degree one normal elements

In order to consider the isomorphism problem for homogenized quantized Weyl algebras and quantum matrix algebras, we identify homogeneous degree one normal elements.

Let A be an algebra satisfying Hypothesis 1. We define the ideals the ideals $I_0 \subset I_1 \subset \cdots \subset I_n$ of A where I_k/I_{k-1} is generated by all (homogeneous) degree one normal elements in A/I_{k-1}. By convention we set $I_k = 0$ for $k < 0$. We frequently identify elements in A with their images in A/I_{k-1}. An algebra $B = A/I_k$ for some k is an iterative quotient of A (by degree one normal elements).

It is clear that B also satisfies Hypothesis 1. Moreover, if $\Phi : A \to A'$ is an isomorphism of algebras satisfying Hypothesis 1, then $A/I_k \cong A'/\Phi(I_k)$ for all $k > 0$.

Our goal is to identify degree one normal elements in each such quotient.

Theorem 3.1. In the case of $H_n^{\mathbf{P},\gamma}$, $I_0 = \langle z \rangle$ and for $0 < k \leq n$, $I_k/I_{k-1} = \langle x_k, y_k \rangle$.

Proof. Suppose $u \in H_n^{\mathbf{P},\gamma}$ is a degree one normal element and write

$$u = az + \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\alpha_{1i} x_i + \alpha_{2i} y_i),$$

with $a, \alpha_i, \beta_i \in \Bbbk$ and $m \leq n$. We may assume α_{1m} or α_{2m} is nonzero. Both cases are similar so assume the former. Then

$$uy_m = ay_m z + \alpha_{1m} \left(z^2 + \gamma_m y_m x_m + \sum_{l<m} (\gamma_l - 1) y_l x_l \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \alpha_{1i} (p_{mi} y_m x_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \alpha_{2i} y_i y_m.$$

By normality, there exists $r \in H_n^{\mathbf{P},\gamma}$ such that $uy_m = ru$. Write

$$r = bz + \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\beta_{1i} x_i + \beta_{2i} y_i).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} ru = &\sum_{i=1}^{m} ((b\alpha_{1i} + a\beta_{1i}) x_i z + (b\alpha_{2i} + a\beta_{2i}) y_i z) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\alpha_{1i}\beta_{1i} x_i^2 + \alpha_{2i}\beta_{2i} y_i^2) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} ((\alpha_{1i}\beta_{1m} + \gamma_i p_{im} \alpha_{1m}\beta_{1i}) x_i x_m + (\alpha_{2i}\beta_{2m} + p_{im}\alpha_{2m}\beta_{2i}) y_i y_m) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} ((\alpha_{1i}\beta_{2m} + p_{mi}\alpha_{2m}\beta_1 i) y_m x_i + (\alpha_{1m}\beta_{2i} + \gamma_i p_{im}\alpha_{2i}\beta_{1m}) y_i x_m) \\ &+ (\text{additional terms in } y_i x_i \text{ and } z^2). \end{aligned}$$

We now evaluate several coefficients in $0 = ru - uy_m$. The coefficient of x_m^2 is $\alpha_{1m}\beta_{1m}$, so $\beta_{1m} = 0$ by our hypothesis on α_{1m}. It follows that the coefficient of $x_i x_m$ is $\gamma_i p_{im} \alpha_{1m} \beta_{1i}$, so $\beta_{1i} = 0$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$. The coefficient of $x_m z$ is $b\alpha_{1m}$ so $b = 0$. Finally, it follows that the coefficient of $y_i x_m$ for $i < m$ is $\alpha_{1m}\beta_{2i}$

so $\beta_{2i} = 0$ for $i < m$. Thus

$$ru = \beta_{2m} y_m \left(az + \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\alpha_{1i} x_i + \alpha_{2i} y_i) \right) = \beta_{2m} \left(a y_m z + \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\alpha_{1i} y_m x_i + \alpha_{2i} p_{mi} y_i y_m) \right).$$

But then the coefficient of z^2 in $ru - uy_m$ is $-\alpha_{1m}$, a contradiction. Since $z \in I_0$ it follows that $I_0 = (z)$.

The general statement is similar. Let $B = H_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma}/I_{k-1}$ be an iterative quotient. Write

$$v = \sum_{i=k}^{m} (\alpha_{1i} x_i + \alpha_{2i} y_i) + I_{k-1}.$$

It is clear that $x_k, y_k \in I_k$ and an analysis as above shows that $v = \alpha_{1k} x_k + \alpha_{2k} y_k$. □

Corollary 3.2. $H_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma}$ is Artin-Schelter regular of global and GK dimension $2n + 1$.

Proof. Observe that $H_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma}/I_{n-1} \cong \mathcal{O}_q(\Bbbk^2)$, the quantum plane with $q = \gamma_1$, and $\mathcal{O}_q(\Bbbk^2)$ is Artin-Schelter regular of global and GK dimension 2 [2]. By Theorem 3.1, $(z, x_1, y_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}, y_{n-1})$ is a regular normalizing sequence. Hence, $H_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma}$ has the required properties by [8, Lemma 5.7 and Corollary 5.10]. □

Remark 3.3. Observe from the defining relations of $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$ that for every pair of generators X_{im}, X_{lj} with $l > i$ and $m > j$ there exists a unique pair $X_{ij}, X_{lm} \notin \{X_{im}, X_{lj}\}$ such that $X_{im}X_{lj}$ is a linear combination of $X_{ij}X_{lm}$ and $X_{lm}X_{ij}$. Moreover, if $l = i$ or $m = j$, then there is no such pair.

Theorem 3.4. In the case of $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$,

$$I_k/I_{k-1} = \langle X_{1(n-k)}, X_{(n-k)1}, X_{2(n-k+1)}, X_{(n-k+1)2}, \ldots, X_{(k+1)n}, X_{n(k+1)} \rangle, \quad 1 \leq k < n.$$

Proof. Let $B = \mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))/I_{k-1}$ and recall that in case $k = 0$ we have $I_{k-1} = 0$. It is clear from the defining relations that the given generators are degree one normal elements in B.

Let u be a degree one normal element of B. Suppose by way of contradiction that u has a summand X_{ij} such that

$$X_{ij} \notin \{X_{1(n-k)}, X_{(n-k)1}, X_{2(n-k+1)}, X_{(n-k+1)2}, \ldots, X_{(k+1)n}, X_{n(k+1)}\}.$$

Hence, there exists X_{lm} such that $l > i$ and $m > j$ or $l < i$ and $m < j$. We consider the first case though the second is similar. For simplicity, write $x_1 = X_{ij}$, $x_2 = X_{im}$, $x_3 = X_{lj}$, $x_4 = X_{lm}$, and

$$u = ax_1 + bx_2 + cx_3 + dx_4 + \mathbf{x}$$

where $a, b, c, d \in \Bbbk$ and $\mathbf{x}$ is a degree one element such that $x_1, \ldots, x_4$ are not summands. By hypothesis, $a \neq 0$. Then

$$x_4 u = a(p_{li}p_{jm}x_1x_4 + (\lambda - 1)p_{li}x_2x_3) + b\lambda p_{li}x_2x_4 + cp_{li}x_3x_4 + dx_4^2 + x_4\mathbf{x}.$$

Clearly $x_1x_4, x_2x_4, x_3x_4, x_4^2$ are not summands of $x_4\mathbf{x}$. Since x_1, x_4 is the unique pair such that x_2x_3 is a linear combination of x_1x_4 and x_4x_1, and x_1 is not a summand of $\mathbf{x}$, then by Remark 3.3, x_2x_3 is also not a summand of $x_4\mathbf{x}$.

Because u is normal, there exists $r \in B$ such that $x_4 u = ur$. Write

$$r = a'x_1 + b'x_2 + c'x_3 + d'x_4 + \mathbf{y}$$

where $a', b', c', d' \in \Bbbk$ and $\mathbf{y}$ is a degree one element such that $x_1, \ldots, x_4$ are not summands.

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} ur &= (ax_1 + bx_2 + cx_3 + dx_4 + \mathbf{x})(a'x_1 + b'x_2 + c'x_3 + d'x_4 + \mathbf{y}) \\ &= (aa'x_1^2 + bb'x_2^2 + cc'x_3^2 + dd'x_4^2) + (ab' + p_{jm}a'b)x_1x_2 + (ac' + \lambda p_{li}a'c)x_1x_3 + (ad' + p_{li}p_{jm}a'd)x_1x_4 \\ &\quad + (bd' + \lambda p_{li}b'd)x_2x_4 + (cd' + p_{jm}c'd)x_3x_4 + (bc' + \lambda p_{li}p_{mj}b'c + (a'd)(\lambda - 1))x_2x_3 + \mathbf{x}r + u\mathbf{y}. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that x_1^2 is not a summand of $x_4\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{x}r$, or $u\mathbf{y}$. Hence, because $x_4u = ur$, we must have $0 = aa'$. But $a \neq 0$ by hypothesis so $a' = 0$. The expression for ur now reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} ur &= (bb'x_2^2 + cc'x_3^2 + dd'x_4^2) + ab'x_1x_2 + ac'x_1x_3 + ad'x_1x_4 \\ &\quad + (bd' + \lambda p_{li}b'd)x_2x_4 + (cd' + p_{jm}c'd)x_3x_4 + (bc' + \lambda p_{li}p_{mj}b'c)x_2x_3 + \mathbf{x}r + u\mathbf{y}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, because $x_2 = X_{im}$ and $x_1 = X_{ij}$, then by Remark 3.3, x_1x_2 is not a summand of $x_4\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{x}r$, or $u\mathbf{y}$. Thus, $ab' = 0$ so $b' = 0$. The same logic applies to x_3 and x_1 so $c' = 0$. Hence,

$$ur = dd'x_4^2 + ad'x_1x_4 + bd'x_2x_4 + cd'x_3x_4 + \mathbf{x}r + u\mathbf{y}.$$

Finally, we can apply similar reasoning to conclude that x_2x_3 is not a summand of ur. Hence, the coefficient of x_2x_3 in x_4u must be zero. It follows that $a(\lambda - 1)p_{li} = 0$, so $\lambda = 1$, a contradiction. □

4. Homogenized quantized Weyl algebras

The following was proved in [6, Proposition 5.4.5]. However, in light of Theorem 3.1, we give a much simpler proof that also outlines the strategy for the general case.

Proposition 4.1. $H(A_1^p(\Bbbk)) \cong H(A_1^q(\Bbbk))$ if and only if $p = q^{\pm 1}$.

Proof. Let $\{X, Y, Z\}$ (resp. $\{x, y, z\}$) be the standard basis of $H(A_1^p(\Bbbk))$ (resp. $H(A_1^q(\Bbbk))$). If $p = q$, then there is nothing to prove. If $p = q^{-1}$, then the map given by $X \mapsto -qy$, $Y \mapsto x$, and $Z \mapsto z$ clearly extends to a bijective homomorphism.

Conversely, suppose $\Phi : H(A_1^p(\Bbbk)) \to H(A_1^q(\Bbbk))$ is a graded isomorphism. Since $\Phi((Z)) = (z)$ by Theorem 3.1, then there is an induced isomorphism

$$\mathcal{O}_p(\Bbbk^2) \cong H(A_1^p(\Bbbk))/(Z) \cong H(A_1^q(\Bbbk))/(z) \cong \mathcal{O}_q(\Bbbk^2).$$

By Theorem 2.4, $p = q^{\pm 1}$. □

We now move to the general case.

Lemma 4.2. Suppose $\Phi : H_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma} \to H_n^{\mathbf{q},\mu}$ is an isomorphism. For all k, $1 \leq k \leq n$, $\mu_k = \gamma_k^{\pm 1}$. That is, γ and μ satisfy (1-1).

Proof. Fix k, $1 \leq k \leq n$. Suppose first that $\gamma_k \neq 1$. By Theorem 3.1, $I_k = \langle X_k, Y_k \rangle$ is mapped bijectively to $J_k = \Phi(I_k) = \langle x_k, y_k \rangle$. Thus, there exists $a, b, c, d \in \Bbbk$ with $ab - cd \neq 0$ such that

$$\Phi(X_k) = ax_k + by_k + J_{k-1} \text{ and } \Phi(Y_k) = cx_k + dy_k + J_{k-1}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \Phi(X_kY_k - \gamma_kY_kX_k + I_{k-1}) \\
&= (ax_k + by_k)(cx_k + dy_k) - \gamma_k(cx_k + dy_k)(ax_k + by_k) + J_{k-1} \\
&= (1-\gamma_k)(acx_k^2 + bdy_k^2) + (ad - \gamma_k bc)(x_ky_k) + (bc - \gamma_k ad)y_kx_k + J_{k-1} \\
&= (1-\gamma_k)(acx_k^2 + bdy_k^2) + (ad - \gamma_k bc)(\mu_k y_kx_k) + (bc - \gamma_k ad)y_kx_k + J_{k-1} \\
&= (1-\gamma_k)(acx_k^2 + bdy_k^2) + [ad(\mu_k - \gamma_k) + bc(1 - \mu_k\gamma_k)]\, y_kx_k + J_{k-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Because $\gamma_k \neq 1$, then the coefficients of x_k^2 and y_k^2 must be zero on the above. Hence, $ac = 0$ and $bd = 0$. But $ad - bc \neq 0$ and so we have two cases. In the first case, $b = c = 0$ and $a, d \neq 0$ so $\mu_k = \gamma_k$. In the second case, $a = d = 0$ and $b, c \neq 0$ so $\mu_k = \gamma_k^{-1}$.

If $\mu_k \neq 1$, then an argument as above shows that $\gamma_k = \mu_k^{\pm 1}$. Thus, $\gamma_k = 1$ if and only if $\mu_k = 1$. □

Lemma 4.3. Suppose $\Phi : H_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma} \to H_n^{\mathbf{q},\mu}$ is an isomorphism. Then $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{q}$ satisfy (1-2).

Proof. Let $V_k = \mathrm{Span}_{\Bbbk}\{z, x_\ell, y_\ell \mid \ell < k\}$. Because Φ is assumed to be graded, then it follows from Theorem 3.1 that for $i < j$,

$$\Phi(Y_i) = ax_i + by_i + K \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(Y_j) = cx_j + dy_j + L$$

for some $K \in V_i$ and $L \in V_j$.

We have,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \Phi(Y_iY_j - p_{ij}Y_jY_i) \\
&= (ax_i + by_i + K)(cx_j + dy_j + L) - p_{ij}(cx_j + dy_j + L)(ax_i + by_i + K) \\
&= ac(x_ix_j - p_{ij}x_jx_i) + ad(x_iy_j - p_{ij}y_jx_i) + bc(y_ix_j - p_{ij}x_jy_i) + bd(y_iy_j - p_{ij}y_jy_i) \\
&\qquad + (ax_i + by_i + K)L - p_{ij}L(ax_i + by_i + K) \\
&= ac(\mu_iq_{ij} - p_{ij})x_jx_i + ad(q_{ji} - p_{ij})y_jx_i + bc(1 - p_{ij}\mu_iq_{ij})x_jy_i + bd(q_{ij} - p_{ij})y_jy_i \\
&\qquad + (ax_i + by_i + K)L - p_{ij}L(ax_i + by_i + K).
\end{aligned}$$

The defining relations clearly imply that the monomials x_jx_i, y_jy_i, x_jy_i, and y_jy_i do not appear as summands of $(ax_i + by_i + K)L - p_{ij}L(ax_i + by_i + K)$. Hence, the coefficients of those monomials in the above must each be zero.

Suppose $\gamma_i, \gamma_j \neq 1$. By the proof of Lemma 4.2, exactly one of ac, ad, bc, bd is nonzero, corresponding to the signs of the exponents in $\gamma_i = \mu_i^{\pm 1}$ and $\gamma_j = \mu_j^{\pm 1}$. If $\gamma_i = \mu_i$ and $\gamma_j = \mu_j$, then $a, d \neq 0$ and so $q_{ij} = p_{ij}$. The other cases are similar.

If $\gamma_i = 1$ or $\gamma_j = 1$, then the argument is similar. However, we get additional restrictions on the parameters. For example, if $\gamma_i = 1$ and $\gamma_j \neq 1$, then we may have $ad, bd \neq 0$ implying $q_{ij} = p_{ij} = q_{ji}$, so $q_{ij} = \pm 1$. □

Theorem 4.4. Let $\gamma, \mu \in (\Bbbk^\times)^n$ and $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{A}_n$ Then $\Phi : H_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma} \to H_m^{\mathbf{q},\mu}$ is an isomorphism if and only if $n = m$ and there exists $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ such that γ and μ satisfy (1-1) while $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{q}$ satisfy (1-2).

Proof. Suppose $H_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma} \cong H_m^{\mathbf{q},\mu}$. By Corollary 3.2, $2n + 1 = \mathrm{GK.\,dim}(H_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma}) = \mathrm{GK.\,dim}(H_m^{\mathbf{q},\mu}) = 2m + 1$, so $n = m$. By Lemma 4.2, γ and μ satisfy (1-1) and by Lemma 4.3, $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{q}$ satisfy (1-2).

Conversely, suppose there exists $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ such that λ and μ satisfy (1-1) while $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{q}$ satisfy (1-2). The isomorphisms provided in [7] are affine and hence extend to bijective homomorphisms $H_n^{\mathbf{p},\gamma} \to H_n^{\mathbf{q},\mu}$. □

5. Quantum matrix algebras

Throughout, let $\{X_{ij}\}$ and $\{Y_{ij}\}$ be the standard generators for $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$, respectively. As in Section 3, we let I_k/I_{k-1} be the ideal in $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))/I_{k-1}$ generated by the degree one normal elements.

Proposition 5.1. For $i > j$, let $p_{ij} = \lambda^{-1} q_{ji}$. The map $\Phi : \mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk)) \to \mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$ defined by $\Phi(X_{ij}) = Y_{ji}$ extends to an isomorphism.

Proof. We claim the map Φ satisfies the defining relations for $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$, whence Φ extends to a homomorphism. As Φ maps onto the generators of $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$, it is clearly surjective. Injectivity now follows because $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$ are domains and $\mathrm{GK.\,dim}(\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))) = n^2 = \mathrm{GK.\,dim}(\mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk)))$.

Case 1 ($l = i$, $m > j$)

$$\Phi(X_{im})\Phi(X_{ij}) - p_{jm}\Phi(X_{ij})\Phi(X_{im}) = Y_{mi}Y_{ji} - \lambda q_{mj} Y_{ji}Y_{mi} = (\lambda q_{mj} q_{ii} Y_{ji}Y_{mi}) - \lambda q_{mj} Y_{ji}Y_{mi} = 0.$$

Case 2 ($l > i$, $m < j$)

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(X_{lm})\Phi(X_{ij}) - \lambda p_{li}p_{jm}\Phi(X_{ij})\Phi(X_{lm}) &= Y_{ml}Y_{ji} - \lambda(\lambda^{-1}q_{il})(\lambda^{-1}q_{mj})Y_{ji}Y_{ml} \\ &= Y_{ml}Y_{ji} - \lambda^{-1} q_{il}q_{mj}(\lambda q_{jm}q_{li}Y_{ml}Y_{ji}) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Case 3 ($l > i$, $m = j$)

$$\Phi(X_{lj})\Phi(X_{ij}) - \lambda p_{li}\Phi(X_{ij})\Phi(X_{lm}) = Y_{jl}Y_{ji} - \lambda(\lambda^{-1}q_{il})Y_{ji}Y_{jl} = (q_{il}Y_{ji}Y_{jl}) - q_{il}Y_{ji}Y_{jl} = 0.$$

Case 4 ($l > i$, $m > j$)

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(X_{lm})\Phi(X_{ij}) - p_{li}p_{jm}\Phi(X_{ij})\Phi(X_{lm}) + (\lambda-1)p_{li}X_{im}X_{lj}) \\ &= Y_{ml}Y_{ji} - (\lambda^{-1}q_{il})(\lambda q_{mj})Y_{ji}Y_{ml} + (\lambda-1)(\lambda^{-1}q_{il})Y_{mi}Y_{jl} \\ &= (q_{mj}q_{il}Y_{ji}Y_{ml} + (\lambda-1)q_{mj}Y_{jl}Y_{mi}) - q_{il}q_{mj}Y_{ji}Y_{ml} + (\lambda-1)(\lambda^{-1}q_{il})(\lambda q_{mj}q_{li})Y_{jl}Y_{mi} = 0. \square\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5.2. Let $p_{ij} = q_{n+1-i,n+1-j}$ and $\lambda = \mu^{-1}$. The map $\Phi : \mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk)) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$ defined by $\Phi(X_{ij}) = Y_{n+1-i,n+1-j}$ extends to an isomorphism.

Proof. We claim the map Φ satisfies the defining relations for $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$, whence Φ extends to a bijective homomorphism by an analogous argument as in Proposition 5.1.

Set $r = n+1-l$, $s = n+1-m$, $u = n+1-i$, and $v = n+1-j$.

Case 1 ($l = i, m > j$) We have $r = u$ and $s > v$. Thus,

$$\Phi(X_{lm})\Phi(X_{ij}) - p_{jm}\Phi(X_{ij})\Phi(X_{lm}) = Y_{rs}Y_{uv} - p_{jm}Y_{uv}Y_{rs} = (q_{vs} - p_{jm})Y_{uv}Y_{rs} = 0.$$

Case 2 ($l > i$, $m \leq j$) We have $r < u$ and $v \leq s$. Thus,

$$\Phi(X_{lm})\Phi(X_{ij}) - \lambda p_{li}p_{jm}\Phi(X_{ij})\Phi(X_{lm}) = Y_{rs}Y_{uv} - \lambda p_{li}p_{jm}Y_{uv}Y_{rs} = (1 - \lambda p_{li}p_{jm}\mu q_{ur}q_{sv})Y_{rs}Y_{uv} = 0.$$

Case 3 ($l > i$, $m > j$) We have $r < u$ and $s < v$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(X_{lm})\Phi(X_{ij}) - p_{li}p_{jm}\Phi(X_{ij})\Phi(X_{lm}) - (\lambda-1)p_{li}\Phi(X_{im})\Phi(X_{lj}) \\ &= Y_{rs}Y_{uv} - p_{li}p_{jm}Y_{uv}Y_{rs} - (\lambda-1)p_{li}Y_{us}Y_{rv} \\ &= Y_{rs}Y_{uv} - p_{li}p_{jm}(q_{ur}q_{sv}Y_{rs}Y_{uv} + (\mu-1)q_{ur}Y_{rv}Y_{us}) - (\lambda-1)p_{li}(\mu q_{ur}q_{vs})Y_{rv}Y_{us} \\ &= -p_{li}q_{ur}((\mu-1)p_{jm} + (\lambda-1)\mu q_{vs}) = 0. \square\end{aligned}$$

The key question is whether there are any more types of isomorphisms.

Lemma 5.3. Suppose $\Phi : \mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk)) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$ is a graded isomorphism.

(1) If $p_{jm} \neq 1$, then $\Phi(X_{ij})$ and $\Phi(X_{im})$ do not share any summands.

(2) If $\lambda p_{li} \neq 1$, then $\Phi(X_{ij})$ and $\Phi(X_{lj})$ do not share any summands.

(3) For all i, j, $\Phi(X_{ij})$ and $\Phi(X_{ji})$ do not share any summands.

Proof. (1) WLOG, assume $m > j$. Suppose Y_{uv} is a summand of both $\Phi(X_{ij})$ and $\Phi(X_{im})$ with coefficient a and b, respectively. The coefficient of Y_{uv}^2 in $0 = \Phi(X_{im}X_{ij} - p_{jm}X_{ij}X_{lm})$ is $ab(1-p_{jm})$. Hence, $a = 0$ or $b = 0$, a contradiction. (2) is similar.

(3) WLOG, assume $i > j$. Suppose Y_{uv} is a summand of both $\Phi(X_{ij})$ and $\Phi(X_{ji})$ with coefficient a and b, respectively. The coefficient of Y_{uv}^2 in $0 = \Phi(X_{ii}X_{jj} - X_{jj}X_{ii} - (\lambda-1)p_{ij}X_{ji}X_{ij})$ is $-(\lambda-1)p_{ij}ab$. Hence, $a = 0$ or $b = 0$, a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 5.4. $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk)) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$ implies $\lambda = \mu^{\pm 1}$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.4, the degree one normal elements of $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$) are X_{1n} and X_{n1} (resp. Y_{1n} and Y_{n1}). Consequently, $\Phi(X_{1n})$ and $\Phi(X_{n1})$ are linear combinations of Y_{1n}, Y_{n1}. Write

$$\Phi(X_{11}) = a_1Y_{11} + b_1Y_{nn} + c_1Y_{1n} + d_1Y_{n1} + \mathbf{x}, \qquad \Phi(X_{1n}) = c_3Y_{1n} + d_3Y_{n1},$$
$$\Phi(X_{nn}) = a_2Y_{11} + b_2Y_{nn} + c_2Y_{1n} + d_2Y_{n1} + \mathbf{y}, \qquad \Phi(X_{n1}) = c_4Y_{1n} + d_4Y_{n1}.$$

where $a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i \in \Bbbk$ and $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$ are linear terms not containing $Y_{11}, Y_{nn}, Y_{1n}, Y_{n1}$ as summands. By Proposition 5.2 and Lemma 5.3 (3), we can reduce to the case $d_3 = c_4 = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \Phi(X_{1n}X_{11} - p_{1n}X_{11}X_{1n}) \\
&= c_3\left[a_1(q_{1n} - p_{1n})Y_{11}Y_{1n} + b_1(1 - \mu p_{1n}q_{n1})Y_{1n}Y_{nn}\right. \\
&\quad \left. + c_1(1 - p_{1n})Y_{1n}^2 + d_1(\mu q_{1n}^2 - p_{1n})Y_{1n}Y_{n1}\right] \\
&\quad + (\text{additional terms not in } Y_{11}Y_{1n}, Y_{1n}Y_{nn}, Y_{1n}^2, Y_{1n}Y_{n1}), \\
0 &= \Phi(X_{n1}X_{11} - \lambda p_{n1}X_{11}X_{n1}) \\
&= d_4\left[a_1(\mu q_{n1} - \lambda p_{n1})Y_{11}Y_{n1} + b_1(1 - \lambda p_{n1}q_{1n})Y_{n1}Y_{nn}\right. \\
&\quad \left. + c_1(1 - \lambda\mu p_{n1}q_{n1}^2)Y_{1n}Y_{n1} + d_1(1 - \lambda p_{n1})Y_{n1}^2\right] \\
&\quad + (\text{additional terms not in } Y_{11}Y_{n1}, Y_{11}Y_{1n}, Y_{1n}Y_{n1}, Y_{n1}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

If $a_1 \neq 0$, then $q_{1n} = p_{1n}$ and $\mu q_{n1} = \lambda p_{n1}$, so $\mu = \lambda$. If $b_1 \neq 0$, then $1 = \mu p_{1n}q_{n1}$ and $1 = \lambda p_{n1}q_{1n}$, so $\mu p_{1n}q_{n1} = \lambda p_{n1}q_{1n}$ implies $\lambda = \mu^{-1}$. A similar argument using X_{nn} in place of X_{11} shows that if $a_2 \neq 0$ or $b_2 \neq 0$, then $\lambda = \mu^{\pm 1}$. Moreover, one can show that if X_{11} or X_{nn} are summands of either $\Phi^{-1}(Y_{11})$ or $\Phi^{-1}(Y_{nn})$ then $\lambda = \mu^{\pm 1}$.

We now reduce to the case that $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 = 0$. In $0 = \Phi(X_{11}X_{nn} - X_{nn}X_{11} + (\lambda - 1)p_{n1}X_{1n}X_{n1})$ the coefficient of $Y_{1n}Y_{n1}$ is

$$(1 - \mu q_{n1}^2)(c_1d_2 - c_2d_1) + (\lambda - 1)p_{n1}c_3d_4.$$

If $p_{n1}, \lambda p_{n1} \neq 1$, then $c_1, d_1, c_2, d_2 = 0$ by Lemma 5.3 (1,2) and this coefficient reduces to $(\lambda - 1)p_{n1}c_3d_4 \neq 0$, a contradiction. Thus, $p_{n1} = 1$ or $\lambda p_{n1} = 1$. We may further assume that $q_{n1} = 1$ or $\lambda q_{n1} = 1$. Thus, we have four cases to consider. Note that

$$0 = \Phi(X_{n1}X_{1n} - \lambda p_{n1}^2X_{1n}X_{n1}) = c_3d_4(\mu q_{n1}^2 - \lambda p_{n1}^2)Y_{1n}Y_{n1}.$$

Thus, $\lambda p_{n1}^2 = \mu q_{n1}^2$. If $p_{n1} = q_{n1} = 1$, then $\lambda = \mu$. If $\lambda p_{n1} = q_{n1} = 1$, then $p_{n1} = \mu$ so $\lambda = \mu^{-1}$. The other two cases follow similarly. □

Suppose $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk)) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$. By Lemma 5.4, $\lambda = \mu^{\pm 1}$. If $\lambda = \mu^{-1}$, then by Proposition 5.2 we can replace $\mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$ by $\mathcal{O}_{\mu^{-1},\mathbf{q}'}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$. Thus, it suffices to consider the isomorphism problem for the case where $\lambda = \mu$.

5.1. **The $n = 2$ case.** As in the homogenized quantized Weyl algebra case, we consider the $n = 2$ case to illustrate methods in the general case. We will prove an extension of [5, Proposition 4.2], removing any restriction on the parameters.

Let $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \in \mathcal{A}_2$ and set $p = p_{12}$ and $q = q_{12}$. We denote $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_2(\Bbbk))$ by $M_{\lambda,p}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_2(\Bbbk))$ by $M_{\mu,q}$. Recall that, by assumption, $\lambda^2, \mu^2 \neq 1$.

For simplicity, we write the basis $\{X_{ij}\}$ as $x_1 = X_{11}$, $x_2 = X_{12}$, $x_3 = X_{21}$, and $x_4 = X_{22}$. The defining relations for $M_{\lambda,p}$ are then

$$x_2x_1 = px_1x_2 \qquad x_4x_3 = px_3x_4 \qquad x_3x_2 = \lambda p^2 x_2x_3$$
$$x_3x_1 = \lambda p x_1x_3 \qquad x_4x_2 = \lambda p x_2x_4 \qquad x_4x_1 = x_1x_4 + (\lambda p - p)x_2x_3.$$

We rewrite the basis and defining relations for $M_{\mu,q}$ similarly.

Lemma 5.5. If $M_{\lambda,p} \cong M_{\lambda,q}$, then $q = p$ or $q = \lambda^{-1}p^{-1}$.

Proof. Let $\Phi : M_{\lambda,p} \to M_{\lambda,q}$ be an isomorphism. Write $\Phi(x_i) = \sum_{k=1}^{4} a_{ik}y_k$. By Theorem 3.4, any normal element in $M_{\lambda,p}$ has the form $bx_2 + cx_3$ and similarly for $M_{\lambda,q}$. Hence,

$$\Phi(x_2) = a_{22}y_2 + a_{23}y_3 \text{ and } \Phi(x_3) = a_{32}y_2 + a_{33}y_3,$$

with $a_{22}a_{33} - a_{23}a_{32} \neq 0$. By Lemma 5.3, $\Phi(x_2)$ and $\Phi(x_3)$ may not share any summands. Thus, we conclude that there are two cases, $a_{23} = a_{32} = 0$, or $a_{22} = a_{33} = 0$.

By Theorem 3.4, Φ restricts to a graded isomorphism

$$\Bbbk[x_1, x_4] \cong M_{\lambda,p}/\langle x_2, x_3\rangle \cong M_{\lambda,q}/\langle y_2, y_3\rangle \cong \Bbbk[y_1, y_4].$$

Hence, $a_{11}a_{44} - a_{14}a_{41} \neq 0$. Write, $\Phi(x_1) = a_{11}y_1 + a_{14}y_4 + K$ with $K \in \mathrm{Span}_{\Bbbk}\{y_2, y_3\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(x_2x_1 - px_1x_2) &= (a_{22}y_2 + a_{23}y_3)(a_{11}y_1 + a_{14}y_4 + K) - p(a_{11}y_1 + a_{14}y_4 + K)(a_{22}y_2 + a_{23}y_3)\\ &= a_{11}a_{22}(q-p)y_1y_2 + a_{14}a_{22}(1-\lambda pq)y_2y_4 + a_{11}a_{23}(\lambda q - p)y_1y_3 + a_{14}a_{23}(1-pq)y_3y_4\\ &\quad + (a_{22}y_2 + a_{23}y_3)K - K(a_{22}y_2 + a_{23}y_3).\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that the monomials $y_1y_2, y_1y_3, y_2y_4, y_3y_4$ do not appear as summands in $(a_{22}y_2 + a_{23}y_3)K - K(a_{22}y_2 + a_{23}y_3)$. Hence, the coefficients of those monomials must be zero.

In the first case, $a_{22} \neq 0$. Then $a_{11} \neq 0$ implies $q = p$ and $a_{14} \neq 0$ implies $q = \lambda^{-1}p^{-1}$.

In the second case, $a_{23} \neq 0$. Then $a_{11} \neq 0$ implies $q = \lambda^{-1}p$ and $a_{14} \neq 0$ implies $q = p^{-1}$. □

Theorem 5.6. If $M_{\lambda,p} \cong M_{\mu,q}$, then (μ, q) is one of (λ, p), (λ^{-1}, p^{-1}), $(\lambda, \lambda^{-1}p^{-1})$, or $(\lambda^{-1}, \lambda p)$.

Proof. If $(\mu, q) = (\lambda, p)$, then there is nothing to prove. If $(\mu, q) = (\lambda, \lambda^{-1}p^{-1})$, then there is an isomorphism by Proposition 5.1. If $(\mu, q) = (\lambda^{-1}, p^{-1})$, then there is an isomorphism by Proposition 5.2. Composing these isomorphisms gives the final case.

Conversely, suppose $\Phi : M_{\lambda,p} \to M_{\mu,q}$ is a graded isomorphism. By Lemma 5.4, $\mu = \lambda^{\pm 1}$. By Proposition 5.2, we may assume $\mu = \lambda$. Lemma 5.5 now completes the proof. $\square$

5.2. **The general case.** Assume $n > 2$. We retain our original notation and let $\{X_{ij}\}$ and $\{Y_{ij}\}$ be the standard homogeneous generators for $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$, respectively.

Lemma 5.7. Let $\Phi : \mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk)) \to \mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))$ be an isomorphism that maps the ideals (X_{1n}) and (X_{n1}) to (Y_{1n}) and (Y_{n1}), respectively. For all $\ell < n$, if $X_{ij} \in I_\ell/I_{\ell-1}$, then the ideal $(X_{ij}) + I_{\ell-1}$ is mapped to $(Y_{ij}) + J_{\ell-1}$.

Proof. Assume throughout that $j > i$. The case with $j < i$ is similar. Throughout we use Φ to denote the given isomorphism as well as any induced isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))/I_k \to \mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))/I_k$.

The lemma is true when $\ell = 0$ by assumption. Assume it holds for all ideals I_k with $k < \ell$. Let S be the set of X_{ij} in $I_\ell/I_{\ell-1}$, $S^+ = \{X_{ij} \in S \mid i < j\}$, and $S^- = \{X_{ij} \in S \mid i > j\}$. Define T, T^+, T^- similarly for the Y_{ij}.

Claim 1: If $X_{lm} \in S^+$ with $X_{lm} \neq X_{ij}$, then Y_{ij} is a summand of $\Phi(X_{ij})$ and not a summand of $\Phi(X_{lm})$.

Either $l > i$ and $m > j$ or $l < i$ and $m < j$. Assume the former. Note that Y_{ij} and Y_{lm} are the only two generators in T^+ such that a linear combination of $Y_{ij}Y_{lm}$ and $Y_{lm}Y_{ij}$ is nonzero in (Y_{im}). Let r be minimal such that $X_{im} \in I_r$. Because $m > j$ then it follows that $r < \ell$. Hence, by the inductive hypothesis, $\Phi((X_{im}) + I_{r-1}) = (Y_{im}) + J_{r-1}$. Let $U = \{Y_{uv} \in J_\ell \mid (u,v) \neq (i,j), (l,m)\}$. Then

$$\Phi(X_{ij}) = a_1 Y_{ij} + b_1 Y_{lm} + K \text{ and } \Phi(X_{lm}) = a_2 Y_{ij} + b_2 Y_{lm} + L$$

for some $K, L \in \operatorname{Span}_{\Bbbk}\{U\}$ and $a_i, b_j \in \Bbbk$ with $a_1 b_2 - b_1 a_2 \neq 0$. We will show that $b_1 = a_2 = 0$.

Suppose b_1 and a_2 are nonzero. Write $\Phi(X_{im}) = \alpha Y_{im} + J_{r-1}$, $\alpha \in \Bbbk^\times$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \Phi(X_{im}X_{ij} - p_{jm}X_{ij}X_{im} + I_{r-1}) \\
&= \alpha\left(Y_{im}(a_1Y_{ij} + b_1Y_{lm} + K) - p_{jm}(a_1Y_{ij} + b_1Y_{lm} + K)Y_{im}\right) + J_{r-1} \\
&= \alpha\left[a_1(q_{jm} - p_{jm})Y_{ij}Y_{im} + b_1(1 - \lambda q_{li}p_{jm})Y_{im}Y_{lm}\right] + \alpha(Y_{im}K - p_{jm}KY_{im}) + J_{r-1}. \qquad (\star)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $Y_{ij}Y_{im}, Y_{im}Y_{lm}$ are not summands in $(Y_{im}K - p_{jm}KY_{im})$, then our hypothesis that $b_1 \neq 0$ implies $p_{jm} = \lambda^{-1}q_{il}$. Similarly, write $\Phi(X_{mi}) = \beta Y_{mi} + J_{r-1}$ with $\beta \in \Bbbk^\times$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \Phi(X_{lm}X_{im} - \lambda p_{li}X_{im}X_{lm}) \\
&= \alpha\left((a_2Y_{ij} + b_2Y_{lm} + L)Y_{im} - \lambda p_{li}Y_{im}(a_2Y_{ij} + b_2Y_{lm} + L)\right) + J_{r-1} \\
&= \alpha\left(a_2(1 - \lambda p_{li}q_{jm})Y_{ij}Y_{im} + b_2(\lambda q_{li} - \lambda p_{li})Y_{im}Y_{lm}\right) + \beta(LY_{im} - \lambda p_{li}Y_{im}L) + J_{r-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $a_2 \neq 0$ implies $p_{li} = \lambda^{-1} q_{mj}$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \Phi(X_{lm}X_{ij} - p_{li}p_{jm}X_{ij}X_{lm} + (X_{im})) \\
&= (a_2Y_{ij} + b_2Y_{lm} + L)(a_1Y_{ij} + b_1Y_{lm} + K) - p_{li}p_{jm}(a_1Y_{ij} + b_1Y_{lm} + K)(a_2Y_{ij} + b_2Y_{lm} + L) \\
&\qquad + (Y_{im}) + J_{r-1} \\
&= (1 - p_{li}p_{jm})(a_1a_2Y_{ij}^2 + b_1b_2Y_{lm}^2) + \left[a_1b_2(q_{li}q_{jm} - p_{li}p_{jm}) + a_2b_1(1 - p_{li}p_{jm}q_{li}q_{jm})\right] Y_{ij}Y_{lm} \\
&\qquad + (LK - p_{li}p_{jm}KL) + (Y_{im}) + J_{r-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

By hypothesis, $a_2b_1 \neq 0$. Suppose further that $a_1b_2 \neq 0$. Then $a_1a_2, b_1b_2 \neq 0$ and so $p_{li}p_{jm} = 1$. But then the coefficient of $Y_{ij}Y_{lm}$ reduces to $(q_{li}q_{jm} - 1)(a_1b_2 - a_2b_1)$, so $q_{li}q_{lm} = 1$ and

$$1 = p_{li}p_{jm} = (\lambda^{-1}q_{mj})(\lambda^{-1}q_{il}) = \lambda^{-2}.$$

Thus, $\lambda^2 = 1$, violating our hypothesis.

Hence, $a_1b_2 = 0$ Since $a_2b_1 \neq 0$, then

$$1 = p_{li}p_{jm}q_{li}q_{jm} = (\lambda^{-1}q_{mj})(\lambda^{-1}q_{il})q_{li}q_{lm} = \lambda^{-2}.$$

Thus, $\lambda^2 = 1$, again violating our hypothesis.

Claim 2: If $X_{lm} \in S^-$, then Y_{lm} is not a summand of $\Phi(X_{ij})$.

Suppose $Y_{lm} \in T^-$ is a summand of $\Phi(X_{ij})$. If $(l, m) = (j, i)$, then the claim follows by Lemma 5.3. By Claim 1, $\Phi(X_{ij}) = a_1Y_{ij} + b_1Y_{lm} + K$ and $\Phi(X_{ji}) = a_2Y_{ji} + L$ for some $K \in \mathrm{Span}_{\Bbbk}\{U \backslash \{S^+ \cup \{Y_{lm}\}\}\}$, $L \in \mathrm{Span}_{\Bbbk}\{U \backslash S^-\}$ and $a_i, b_j \in \Bbbk$ with $a_1, a_2 \neq 0$. We will show that $b_1 = 0$.

If $l > j$ and $m > i$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \Phi(X_{ji}X_{ij} - \lambda p_{ji}^2 X_{ij}X_{ji}) \\
&= (a_2Y_{ji} + L)(a_1Y_{ij} + b_1Y_{lm} + K) - \lambda p_{ji}^2(a_1Y_{ij} + b_1Y_{lm} + K)(a_2Y_{ji} + L) \\
&= a_1a_2\lambda(q_{ji}^2 - \lambda p_{ji}^2)Y_{ij}Y_{ji} + a_2b_1\left[(1 - \lambda p_{ji}^2 q_{lj}q_{im})Y_{ji}Y_{lm} - (\lambda - 1)\lambda p_{ji}^2 q_{lj}Y_{jm}Y_{li}\right] \\
&\qquad + a_2(Y_{ji}K - \lambda p_{ji}^2 KY_{ji}) + a_1(L(a_1Y_{ij} + b_1Y_{lm}) - \lambda p_{ji}^2(a_1Y_{ij} + b_1Y_{lm})L) + (KL - \lambda p_{ji}^2 LK).
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that Y_{ji}, Y_{lm} is the unique pair such that $Y_{jm}Y_{li}$ is a linear combination of $Y_{ji}Y_{lm}$ and $Y_{lm}Y_{ji}$. Moreover, Y_{ji} and Y_{lm} are not summands of L or K. Hence, we have $a_2b_1 = 0$, so $b_1 = 0$ as claimed. □

We our now ready to prove our main theorem.

Theorem 5.8. $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk)) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_m(\Bbbk))$ if and only if $n = m$ and one of the following cases holds:

(1) $\lambda = \mu$ and $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}$;
(2) $\lambda = \mu$ and $p_{ij} = \lambda^{-1}q_{ji}$ for all i, j;
(3) $\lambda = \mu^{-1}$ and $p_{ij} = q_{n+1-i,n+1-j}$ for all i, j;
(4) $\lambda = \mu^{-1}$ and $p_{ij} = \lambda^{-1}q_{n+1-j,n+1-i}$ for all i, j.

Proof. First, we will establish the indicated isomorphisms. (1) is obtained as from the map $X_{ij} \mapsto Y_{ij}$. (2) and (3) are obtained from Propositions 5.1 and 5.2, respectively, while (4) is the composition of those.

Conversely, let $\Phi : \mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk)) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_m(\Bbbk))$ be an isomorphism. Then $n = m$ since

$$n^2 = \text{GK.}\dim(\mathcal{O}_{\lambda,\mathbf{p}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\Bbbk))) = \text{GK.}\dim(\mathcal{O}_{\mu,\mathbf{q}}(\mathcal{M}_m(\Bbbk))) = m^2.$$

By Lemma 5.4, we may assume $\lambda = \mu$. By Theorem 3.4 and Lemma 5.3, we may assume that $\Phi(X_{1n})$ and $\Phi(X_{n1})$ either fix their respective positions or interchange them. We consider the case where they are fixed and claim that $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}$. Choose $j, m \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $j < m$. By Lemma 5.7, the coefficient of $Y_{1j}Y_{1m}$ in $\Phi(X_{1m}X_{1j} - p_{jm}X_{1j}X_{1m})$ is $p_{jm} - q_{jm}$ (see $(\star)$). Hence, $p_{jm} = q_{jm}$ for all j, m and so $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q}$. □

Acknowledgements. The author thanks Ken Goodearl for helpful discussions and the referee for offering several corrections and points of clarification.

References

1. Michael Artin, William Schelter, and John Tate, *Quantum deformations of* GL_n, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **44** (1991), no. 8-9, 879–895. MR 1127037
2. Michael Artin and William F. Schelter, *Graded algebras of global dimension* 3, Adv. in Math. **66** (1987), no. 2, 171–216. MR 917738
3. Jason Bell and James J. Zhang, *An isomorphism lemma for graded rings*, To appear in Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, arXiv:1509.08812 (2016).
4. Ken A. Brown and Ken R. Goodearl, *Lectures on algebraic quantum groups*, Advanced Courses in Mathematics. CRM Barcelona, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2002. MR 1898492
5. Jason Gaddis, *Isomorphisms of some quantum spaces*, Ring theory and its applications, Contemp. Math., vol. 609, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2014, pp. 107–116. MR 3204354
6. Jason D. Gaddis, *PBW deformations of Artin-Schelter regular algebras and their homogenizations*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2013, Thesis (Ph.D.)–The University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee. MR 3167175
7. K. R. Goodearl and J. T. Hartwig, *The isomorphism problem for multiparameter quantized Weyl algebras*, São Paulo J. Math. Sci. **9** (2015), no. 1, 53–61. MR 3413379
8. Thierry Levasseur, *Some properties of noncommutative regular graded rings*, Glasgow Math. J. **34** (1992), no. 3, 277–300. MR 1181768
9. Jesse Levitt and Milen Yakimov, *Quantized Weyl algebras at roots of unity*, 1606.02121 (2016).
10. Izuru Mori, *Noncommutative projective schemes and point schemes*, Algebras, rings and their representations, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2006, pp. 215–239. MR 2234308
11. Jorge Vitoria, *Equivalences for noncommutative projective spaces*, arXiv:1001.4400 (2011).

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, P.O. Box 7388, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC 27109
E-mail address: gaddisjd@wfu.edu